IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH

AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.16500 of 2007

Dated: August 6, 2007

Between:

Navya Prakash Naidu, D/o. Prakash Naidu,
Aged 18 years, Occ: Student, R/o. Plot No.52,
P & T Colony, Secunderabad.

… Petitioner

And

Board of Intermediate Education, rep. by its
Secretary, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

… Respondent

Order:

Petitioner, a student, has filed this writ petition seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondent in not properly verifying her answer sheet in respect of Maths II-B paper of Intermediate course, which she has appeared in June, 2006 as illegal and arbitrary.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the Board of Intermediate Education appearing for the respondent.

3. Petitioner appeared for II year Intermediate examinations in March/April, 2007 and when results were published in May, 2007, she was found to have secured 80% marks in Physics, Chemistry and Languages, whereas she could not secure pass marks in Maths II-B. Thereafter, petitioner appeared for Maths II-B again in June, 2007 and was expecting 80% marks, however, she could secure 19 marks out of 75. Dissatisfied with the marks she secured, petitioner applied for verification of the answer sheet of Maths II-B, wherein five marks were awarded to Question No.18, as a result of which marks were revised to 24 out of 75.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that though she has fared well in the said examination, and was expecting 80% marks, respondents have not properly valued her answer script, particularly, Question Nos.2, 3, 11, 19, 20 and 24.

5. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent has produced the original record including the answer script of the petitioner.

6. On the request made by the petitioner, respondent has constituted a committee of three lecturers for the purpose of verification of her answer script. The said committee has examined the questions for which '0' marks were awarded. So far Question No.18 is concerned, '5' marks were added to the marks awarded to that question earlier. In spite of adding '5' marks, petitioner did not secure

minimum qualifying marks.

7. Though it is the case of the petitioner that she has fared well and some experts have told her that she was to be awarded not less than 50 marks out of 75, it is to be seen that because the petitioner was expecting higher marks in the said subject and she did not secure such marks, it cannot be said that the valuation and subsequent verification is illegal or arbitrary. As per the request of the petitioner, her answer script was sent for verification to a committee of three lecturers. Even in the verification, the only change that was found is with regard to Question No.18, to which 5 marks were added. In spite of such adding, petitioner could not secure minimum qualifying marks. It is to be seen that expectation of students is not the criterion for awarding marks. It is for the examiners, who are experts in the field, to look into a particular answer and make their own assessment for awarding marks, having regard to the nature of question and the way in which students answer it. In that view of the matter, no direction as sought for can be given.

8. The writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

August 6, 2007
MRR